

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE****United States Patent and Trademark Office**Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231*MF*

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

09/519,964 03/07/00 BELISSENT

J SUN1P601

022434
BEYER WEAVER & THOMAS LLP
P.O. BOX 778
BERKELEY CA 94704-0778

TM02/0910

EXAMINER

MAUNG, Z

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2154

11

DATE MAILED:

09/10/01

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary

Application No. 09/519,964	Applicant(s) Bellissent et al.
Examiner Zarni Maung	Art Unit 2154

— The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address —

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE three MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on Jul 23, 2001

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle* 35 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-19 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-19 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claims _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.

11) The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) approved b) disapproved.

12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

13) Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

a) All b) Some* c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

*See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14) Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

15) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 18) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____

16) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 19) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

17) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). 6,7,8 20) Other: _____

Art Unit: 2154

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to the amendment and remarks filed on July 23, 2001.

Claims 1-19 are presented for further examination.

2. The disclosure is objected to because the text on page 1, lines 10-29 should be updated with the current status of the cited applications, such U.S. Patent Application Serial No., a filing date, U.S. Patent No., and the issue date. Appropriate correction is required.

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. § 103 which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Subject matter developed by another person, which qualifies as prior art only under subsection (f) or (g) of section 102 of this title, shall not preclude patentability under this section where the subject matter and the claimed invention were, at the time the invention was made, owned by the same person or subject to an obligation of assignment to the same person.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103, the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 C.F.R. § 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention

Art Unit: 2154

was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of potential 35 U.S.C. § 102(f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

4. Claims 1-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as obvious over Masters et al., U.S. Patent Number 5,92,0697 (hereinafter Masters) in view of Call, U.S. Patent Number 6,154,738 (hereinafter Call).

Masters discloses a method and system for automatic updating and use of routing information in a messaging system. Masters discloses the invention substantially as claimed. Taking claim 1, as an exemplary claim, Masters discloses a method of identifying, in a directory server, a new mail associated with an incoming message that is received by a messaging server, comprising: receiving a new routing information associated with the incoming message at the messaging server (see column 2, lines 50 to column 3, line 39, receiving at a first site message routing information from a second site; column 8, lines 33-50; when new routing information becomes available in a site, RID process regenerates the routing table based on the newly received replicated information); creating a corresponding entry in a directory in the directory server for every component included in the new routing information that does not already exist in the directory (see column 5, lines 10-37, column 7, line 8 to column 8, line 50, RID process regenerates the routing table based on the newly received information. A site is interested only in previously unknown routes to remote address spaces to update the

Art Unit: 2154

routing table; and RID process disregards known routing information); automatically updating a corresponding real routing record in a server associated with the directory server based upon the entry and identifying the new mail route by the directory server based upon the automatically updated real routing record (see column 5, lines 10-37, column 7, line 8 to column 8, line 50, automatically regenerates the routing table to include the newly received routing information).

5. Masters does not explicitly show the process of using domain name associated with the incoming message at the messaging server; however, Masters discloses the process of a new mail associated with an incoming message that is received by a messaging server and automatically updating a corresponding real routing record in a server associated with the directory server (see column 5, lines 10-37, column 7, line 8 to column 8, line 50, automatically regenerates the routing table to include the newly received routing information). Call discloses a messaging system similar to that of Masters, wherein Call discloses that the use of a domain name associated with the incoming message at the messaging server is well known in the art (see column 5, line 10 to column 6, line 40, column 22, line 55 to column 24, line 44). Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Masters in view of Call by including the use of domain name associated with an incoming message, since Call teaches that the use of a domain name associated

Art Unit: 2154

with the incoming message at the messaging server is well known in the art. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to modify Masters in view of Call so that directory services can be resolved in a proper manner .

As per claim 2, Masters discloses the method as recited in claim 1, further comprising: automatically generating a routing table based upon the created entry (see column 8, lines 36-50).

6. As per claim 3, Masters discloses the method as recited in claim 2, wherein the identifying is also based upon the automatically generated routing table (see column 7, line 8 to column 8, line 59).

7. As per claim 4, Masters discloses the method as recited in claim 3, wherein the messaging server includes a transfer unit that uses the automatically generated routing table to open a channel by which the incoming message is delivered (see column 7, line 8 to column 8, line 59).

8. As per claims 5 and 6, Masters discloses the method as recited in claim 4, wherein the transfer unit includes a local directory used to store most recently used directory entries in a table thereby reducing traffic between the messaging server and

Art Unit: 2154

the directory server (see figure 3, column 7, line 62 to column 8, line 59). Master teaches the process of periodically updating the table whenever the directory server has been updated (see figure 3, column 7, line 8 to column 8, line 59). Masters does not explicitly show that the routing table is stored in a cache. However, it is old and well known in the art to store information in a local cache or fast access storage system. Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Masters by storing the routing table in a cache because it is old and well known in the art to store information in a local cache.

9. As per claim 7, Masters discloses the method as recited in claim 6, wherein the directory is a hierarchically organized directory (see figures 3-6B).

10. As per claim 8, Masters discloses the method as recite in claim 7, wherein Masters does not explicitly show that the hierarchically organized directory is an LDAP based directory information tree (DIT). However, Call discloses a messaging system similar to that of Masters, wherein Call discloses that the use of LDAP based directory information tree (DIT) is well known in the art (see column 5, line 10 to column 6, line 40, column 20, line 27 to column 21, line 5). Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify directory service structure disclosed by Masters in view of Call and include the use of LDAP

Art Unit: 2154

based directory information tree (DIT), since Call teaches that the use of LDAP based directory information tree (DIT) is well known in the art.

11. As per claim 9, Masters discloses the method as recited in claim 1, wherein the creating is based upon a mail exchange record (MX) associated with the incoming email message (see column 2, line 50 to column 3, line 14, column 6, line 53 to column 8, line 50).

12. As per claims 10-19, they do not teach or further define over the limitations recited in claims 1-9 above. Therefore, claims 10-19 are also rejected for the similar reasons set forth in claims 1-9, supra.

13. Applicants arguments filed on July 23, 2001, have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

As per arguments filed on July 23, 2001, the applicants argue in substance that Masters is limited to updating a routing table based upon already known information. The applicants further argue that "claim 1 is directed at creating an entry in a directory for every component (not already in the directory) included in a new domain name associated with an incoming email message. The combination of Masters and Call fails to teach the claimed invention.

Art Unit: 2154

In response to applicants arguments, Masters clearly teaches that the routing table is updated using the newly received routing information at a site. Masters clearly teaches that "Messages are sent by receiving at a first site message routing information from a second site" (see column 2, lines 50 to column 3, line 39). Masters further discloses when new routing information becomes available in a site, RID process regenerates the routing table based on the newly received information (column 8, lines 33-50). Masters discloses that the RID process regenerates the routing table based on the newly received information. Masters further discloses that a site is interested only in previously unknown routes to remote address spaces to update the routing table, and the RID process disregards known routing information. Masters discloses that RID process automatically regenerates the routing table to include the newly received routing information (see column 5, lines 10-37, column 7, line 8 to column 8, line 50). Therefore, Masters does disclose the process of updating the routing table based upon newly received routing information. Masters does not explicitly show the process of using domain name associated with the incoming message at the messaging server; however, Masters discloses the process of a new mail associated with an incoming message that is received by a messaging server and automatically updating a corresponding real routing record in a server associated with the directory server (see column 5, lines 10-37, column 7, line 8 to column 8, line 50, automatically regenerates the routing table to include the newly received routing information). Call discloses a

Art Unit: 2154

messaging system similar to that of Masters, wherein Call discloses that the use of a domain name associated with the incoming message at the messaging server is well known in the art (see column 5, line 10 to column 6, line 40, column 22, line 55 to column 24, line 44). Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Masters in view of Call by including the use of domain name associated with an incoming message, since Call teaches that the use of a domain name associated with the incoming message at the messaging server is well known in the art. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to modify Masters in view of Call so that directory services can be resolved in a proper manner.

14. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

Art Unit: 2154

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Zarni Maung whose telephone number is (703) 308-6687. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 9:30 to 6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, An Meng Ai, can be reached on (703) 305-9678. The fax phone number for this Group is (703) 308-9052.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

September 7, 2001


ZARNI MAUNG
PRIMARY EXAMINER